

channel is then established between the terminal and the remote host. Thus, the invention comprises two separate direct communications links, a first between the terminal and the server, in order to download the communications software, and a second between the terminal and the host, in order to utilize that software.

5

In claim 3, the server is also used in order to assist in presentation of the information downloaded from the server. For example, the screen ID which is generated at the terminal in response to receiving a screen of information from the host is decoded and sent to the server. The server then interprets the particular screen ID, utilizes a table  
10 lookup or other mechanism in order to determine how to present the screen of information as a graphical user interface, and then sends the presentation information to the terminal. This is fully described at, for example, page 7 of applicant's originally submitted specification.

15

Turning to the specific rejections, claims 1-4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Butts Patent No. 5,754,830. Applicants submit that the claims as now drafted are patentable over Butts. Specifically, Butts describes a system wherein a terminal communicates with a server, and the server then communications with an IBM host. (Fig.1) The "client thread" shown in Fig. 1 acts as sort of an adapter in order to  
20 provide a translation between communications with the host and communications with the terminal. As a result, all communications between the terminal and the host must be transmitted through the server. This means that the server is constantly tied up with

standard communications.

5 In contrast to the teachings of Butts, applicant's invention utilizes a first communications link for the sole purpose of downloading to the terminal software required to communicate directly with the host. Once that software is downloaded, the terminal then communicates directly with the host computer. There is no requirement that these communications be entirely through the server. Thus, applicant's invention requires two separate and distinct communications links over the data network, one from the terminal to the host for substantive communications, and one from the terminal to the server which is utilized only to download appropriate communications software and presentation information.

15 The foregoing distinctions are more specifically recited in present claim 1. There is no suggestion in Butts to use two separate communications channels wherein one of them is a direct connection from the terminal to the host. Additionally, as specified by claim 3, there is absolutely no suggestion in Butts to decode each screen of information at the terminal and then transmit the decoded screen ID to a remote server in order to have the remote server specify the GUI presentation for such screen. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 1 and dependant claim 2, as well as independent claim 3. Regarding claim 4, it is dependant upon claim 3 and believed to be patentable for at least the reasons set forth therein. Additionally, claim 4 requires that at the terminal a data structure indicative of the curser position and other screen

information is assembled and transmitted to the server. The server then interprets such information in order to send back context sensitive display information to the terminal. In other words, based upon the context of the screen being displayed at the terminal, the server determines which information to transmit back to the terminal for display. Butts  
5 describes nothing even remotely similar to such a system.

In part 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the subject matter of claims 4 and 6 is taught by Butts in columns 5 through 6. The undersigned has reviewed the cited language and sees nothing in the text which would suggest the concept of  
10 transmitting curser position and screen information to a remote server and in response thereto, downloading context sensitive display information. Nor does the cited text suggest the use of downloading the context sensitive list of available choices for a field as specified by claim 6.

15 Claim 5 is believed to be patentable for all of the reasons set forth with respect to claims 3 and 4.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes there are further issues preventing a notice of allowance from timely issuing, he is  
20 requested to telephone the undersigned. This case being under a petition to make special, it is requested that any further issues be handled by telephone if at all possible.

The Examiner is authorized to deduct additional fees believed due from our Deposit  
Account No. 11-0223.

Respectfully Submitted,

KAPLAN & GILMAN, L.L.P.  
900 Route 9 North, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Woodbridge, NJ 07095  
Telephone (732) 634-7634  
Facsimile (732) 634-6887

Jeffrey I. Kaplan, Esq.  
Reg. No. 64,356

JIK/fp

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence was faxed and is being deposited with the United States Postal service as first class mail, in a postage prepaid envelope, addressed to Box NON-FEE AMENDMENT, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on December 28, 1998.

Dated December 28, 1998

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Print Name Jeffrey I. Kaplan

\\Secretary\myfiles\JKaplan\COMPLEX\PTO\Response to office action of 11-17-98